CALIFORNIA DEPARTMENT OF AGING INTRASTATE FUNDING FORMULA (IFF)

DESCRIPTIVE STATEMENT OF FORMULA

The California Department of Aging is required under Title III of the federal Older Americans Act (OAA) to develop a formula for the distribution of funds within the State under this title. This formula is to take into account, to the maximum extent feasible, the best available statistics on the geographical distribution of individuals aged 60 and older in the State and publish such formula for review and comment. The IFF allocates funds to planning and service areas (PSAs) to serve persons aged 60 and older (60+).

While the OAA is concerned with the provision of services to all older persons, it requires assurance that preference is given to older individuals with greatest economic or social needs, with particular attention to low-income minority individuals. Under the OAA, the term "greatest economic need" means the need resulting from an income level at or below the poverty levels established by the Office of Management and Budget. The term "greatest social need" means the need caused by non-economic factors that include physical and mental disabilities, language barriers, and cultural, social, or geographical isolation including that caused by racial or ethnic status which restricts an individual's ability to perform normal daily tasks or which threatens such individuals' capacity to live independently.

The CDA's IFF was developed: to support the provision of needed services to older persons; to reflect the relative emphasis required by the OAA; to provide consistent emphasis to individuals with certain characteristics, regardless of their area of residence; and to be responsive to California's diversity.

The requirement to give "preference" and "particular attention" to older individuals with certain characteristics recognizes that other older individuals with needs also are served under the OAA. The CDA takes this into account by assigning a weight of one (1.0), the least weight, to the population factor of 60+ Non-Minority, identified here as "other individuals."

The CDA then applied the definitions of greatest economic need and greatest social need in selecting the three remaining factors listed below, and assigned weights to develop a weighted population and to achieve the relative emphasis required by the OAA.

INDIVIDUALS	<u>FACTORS</u>	<u>WEIGHTS</u>
Greatest Economic Need:	60+ Low Income	2.0
Greatest Social Need:	60+ Minority	2.0
	60+ Geographical Isolation (Rura	1) 1.5
Other Individuals	60+ Non Minority	1.0
Medical underserved (IIID only)	60+ Medi-Cal Eligibles	. 1.0

When combined, these population factors and weights result in an allocation of Title III funds which is consistent with the OAA and which is based on the relative degree of emphasis (from 5.5 to 1.0) for the individuals noted below.

•	<u>RELATIVE</u>	<u>EMPHASIS</u> -
	RURAL	OTHER
	<u>AREAS</u>	AREAS
Low Income Minority Individuals	5.5	4.0
Low Income Individuals (not Minority)	4.5	3.0
Minority Individuals (not Low Income)	3.5	2.0
Other Individuals	2.5	1.0

The CDA assumes that the IFF must: be equitable for all PSAs, and reflect consistent application among PSAs of greatest economic or social need, with particular attention to low-income minority individuals; include factors which are mutually exclusive whenever possible; utilize data that are available, dependable, and comparable statewide, and that are updated periodically to reflect current status; reflect changes in population characteristics among PSAs; and be as easy as possible to understand.

NUMERICAL STATEMENT OF THE FORMULA

The following is a description of the Intrastate Funding Formula (IFF used for allocating OAA Title III and VII funds in accordance with Section 45 CFR 1321.37

- 1. The process begins by identifying:
 - a. Total Federal and State matching funds available for allocation to Planning and Service Areas (PSAs) for each Title III and VII program. (Total in Demonstration Column O)
 - b. Population data, updated no more than annually as information is available, by county and arraying these data by PSA. (Population Data Columns A-F on Demonstration)
- 2. The Statewide total amount for the administration allocation is calculated by taking ten percent (10%) of the Federal funds. (The Total in Demonstration Total Column G)

- 3. The Statewide total amount for the program allocation is calculated by subtracting the administration allocation from the total for State and federal funds. (The Total in Demonstration Column M and N)
- 4. Administrative funds are allocated as follows:
 - a. Each PSA receives a fifty thousand dollar (\$50,000) base.
 - b. The balance of total administrative funds identified in 2. above is allocated to PSAs based on each PSA's proportion of California's total persons aged 60 and older.
 - c. Each PSA's total administration allocation is distributed among its qualifying Title III programs based on total qualifying administrative funds available.
- 5. Program funds are allocated based on weighted population figures. Weighted population totals are determined for each PSA by combining the following factors:
 - a. The number of non-minority persons aged 60 and older in each PSA is multiplied by a weight of 1.0 (Demonstration Column H).
 - b. The number of minority persons aged 60 and older in each PSA is multiplied by a weight of 2.0 (Demonstration Column I).
 - c. The number of low-income persons aged 60 and older in each PSA is multiplied by a weight of 2.0 (Demonstration Column J).
 - d. The number of geographically isolated persons aged 60 and older in each PSA is multiplied by a weight of 1.5 (Demonstration Column K).
 - e. The number of Medi-Cal eligible persons aged 60 and older in each PSA is multiplied by a weight of 1.0 (Demonstration Column L) for Title IIID only).
- The total weighted population for each PSA is converted into a proportion of the total weighted population for all PSAs.
- 7. Each PSA's program allotments are determined in the following manner:
 - a. For Title IIIB, C-1, and C-2 programs,
 - Total State and federal program funds available are distributed to each PSA by multiplying each PSA's proportion or total weighted population by total statewide program allocation for Title III B, C and E.
 - ii. Each PSA's program allotment is compared to its 1979 allotment level. If a PSA is under its 1979 level, it receives an allotment equal to its 1979 level in lieu of the computed allotment in 7.a.1.
 - iii. The statewide program allocation is reduced by the total amount allocated to those PSAs receiving allotments equal to their 1979 level. The remaining statewide program allocation is then distributed to the remaining PSAs according to the formula to determine their adjusted total Title III B, C-1 and C-2 program allotments.

- iv. Total program funds for each PSA are then distributed to each Title III program as follows:
 - Federal funds are distributed based on the proportion of funds received by the Department of the latest Notice of Grant Award from the Federal Government.
 - 2. State funds are distributed based upon the statewide totals included in the most recent Budget Act, or Budget bill if allocations impact the next budget year, or other relevant legislation.
- b. For Title IIIE and VII program funds are allocated by multiplying each PSA's proportion of the total weighted population by the total statewide program allocation for each program, then distributing to fund sources as in 7.A.4.
- c. For Title IIID program funds are allocated by multiplying each PSA's proportion of the total weighted population, including Medi-Cal eligibles, by the total statewide program allocation for each program, then distributing to fund sources as in 7.A.4.

CALIFORNIA DEPARTMENT OF AGING POPULATION DATA AND DEMONSTRATION OF AN ALLOCATION

		ſ	न	PSA		—	~	<u></u>	_	٠ <u>٢</u>	φ			on :	e :	= :	2 :	<u>~</u>	₹ ;	<u>۔</u>	e t	: #	ę.	8	<u>ಸ</u>	<u></u>	23	¥ ;	2 2	8 1	77	~~~	- R	3 8	- ;	7 25	3
		Total	Federal	Allocation	٥	\$495,554	1,132,852	1,206,435	5,377,385	699,865	2,695,830	2,541,780	1,898,587	3,842,740	4,311,094	1,544,930	886,634	715,238	2,662,998	1,323,523	4 822 243	1,847,596	15,896,013	4,278,152	4,535,287	096'699'9	6,834,392	548,300	10,532,554	665,613	1,253,758	1,409,813	573,083	3,77,77	911,100	1,038,883	440,040,04
			Weighted	Total A	z	58,470	132,799	142,910	618,218	80,418	339,761	299,054	224,612	466,423	525,399	199,077	100,765	84,493	324,899	162,317	242.503	218.888	1,977,862	513,566	539,401	799,846	816,208	70,047	1,306,040	78,314	145,927	165,796	65,435	143,646	10,877	200 005	4
		111	Weighted W	Total	Σ	54,832	125,365	133,477	595,324	77,482	297,844	281,258	210,061	424,923	476,669	181,905	98,182	79,137	294,435	146,319	14,660	204.413	1,756,762	473,186	501,729	736,618	756,006	60,559	1,164,106	73,653	138,766	156,003	63,455	129,974	63,806	114,928	4
auon	r of Persons	÷	Med-Cal W	Eligibles		3,638	7,434	9,433	22,894	2,936	41,917	17,796	14,551	41,500	48,730	17,172	2,583	5,356	30,464	15,998	550	14.475	221,100	40,380	37,672	63,228	60,202	9,488	141,934	4,661	7,161	9,793	1,980	13,672	1,0,1	7,620	10,100
Demonstration of IFF Anocaudi	Weighted Population = Weight x Number of Persons	1.5	Geo.	Isolation	Х	12,458	37,523	32,130	46,808	3,210	•	4,005	2,190	1,853	4,980	14,955	37,470	9,135	37,380	19,073	4,538	4770	13,710	28,395	32,505	825	28,268	6,608	1,725	20,348	18,218	11,055	16,343	9,893	7,958	11,213	20,100
Jemonstrano	ghted Population	2.0	Low	Income	ı	8,030	15,000	18,300	63,890	2,660	49,380	24,550	16,610	49,060	40,740	25,230	7,610	8,700	40,620	21,340	1,480	19 680	222,540	57,910	65,160	72,890	89,080	9,200	190,250	9,070	14,620	13,440	4,510	18,150	9,520	11,310	20,420
- 	Wei	2.0		Minority	-	7,282	12,882	17,830	201,514	14,694	184,060	114,344	112,192	243,914	255,490	80,642	7,996	25,270	122,482	58,292	2,298	76 952	1.069.585	228,212	191,766	328,450	285,522	37,216	683,833	9,612	27,170	66,544	888'9	46,652	26,232	49,876	020,50
		1.0		Non-Min	I	27,062	29,960	65,217	283,112	53,918	64,404	138,359	690'62	130,096	175,459	61,078	45,106	36,032	93,953	47,614	6,344	107,789	450.927	158,669	212,298	334,453	353,136	7,535	288,298	34,623	78,758	64,964	35,714	55,279	20,096	42,529	610,60
			Area	Allocation	ပ	\$93,995	145,148	156,226	600,058	137,789	274,159	330,183	243,682	411,175	484,471	195,298	120,363	119,736	272,382	159,992	60,737	241,631	1.462.469	440,868	491,602	764,571	760,586	87,461	953,054	106,499	182,321	190,765	106,111	162,636	97,591	146,676	410,002
	Τ		a'	PSA		-	~	.	4	10	9	^	~	6	_ e	=	12		4	5	9 !	~ 0	<u> </u>	23	7	22	23	24	52	- Se	77	28	 23	ළ	— ਲ		- 3
à	<u>L</u> .	6	60+ Wedi Cal		╁	3,638	7,434	9,433	22,894	2,936	41,917	17,796	14,551	41,500	48,730	17,172	2,583	5,356	30,464	15,998	250	10,825	221 100	40,380	37,672	63,228	60,202	9,488	141,934	4,661	7,161	9,793	1,980	13,672	7,071	7,620	10,100
		\$	+09		╁	8,305	25,015	21,420	31,205	2,140	0	2,670	1,460	1,235	3,320	9,970	24,980	060'9	24,920	12,715	3,025	12,500	0.140	18,930	21,670	220	18,845	4,405	1,150	13,565	12,145	7,370	10,895	6,595	5,305	7,475	13,840
n Data Persons)	(2)	la el	÷ 09	Псоще	٥	4.015	7,500	9,150	31,945	2,830	24,690	12,275	8,305	24,530	20,370	12,615	3,805	4,350	20,310	10,670	740	11,485	3,040	28,955	32,580	36,445	. 44,540	4,600	95,125	4,535	7,310	6,720	2,255	9,075	4,760	5,655	15,61
Population Data (Number of Persons)		70	+09	Minority	O	3.641	6,441	8,915	100,757	7,347	92,030	57,172	56,096	121,957	127,745	40,321	3,998	12,635	61,241	29,146	1,149	26,084	524.792	114,106	95,883	164,225	142,761	18,608	341,917	4,806	13,585	33,272	3,444	23,326	13,116	24,938	54,913
		75	+09	Non-Min.	B	27.062	59,960	65,217	283,112	53,918	64,404	138,359	690'62	130,096	175,459	61,078	45,106	36,032	93,953	47,614	6,344	107,789	103,011	158.669	212,298	334,453	353,136	7,535	288,298	34,623	78,758	64,964	35,714	55,279	20,096	42,529	69,819
			•	Pon 60+	A A	30.703	66.401	74.132	383,869	61,265	156,434	195,531	135,165	252,053	303,204	101,399	49,104	48,667	155,194	76,760	7,493	133,873	141,481	272.775	308,181	498,678	495,897	26,143	630,214	39,429	92,343	98,236	39,158	78,605	33,212	67,467	104,732
			ā	DCA	200	.[_							~	_	0	_	7	m	₩.	2	ဖ	~ .	× 0	, 0		. 54	23	74	ξ.	က္	27	28	g	0		N .	2

Notes for Population Data and Demonstration of Allocation

- a. Planning and Service Areas (PSAs) by County: 1 (Del Norte, Humboldt); 2 (Lassen, Modoc, Shasta, Siskiyou, Trinity); 3 (Butte, Colusa, Glenn, Plumas, Tehama); 4 (Nevada, Placer, Sacramento, Sierra, Sutter, Yolo, Yuba); 5 (Marin); 6 (San Francisco); 7 (Contra Costa); 8 (San Mateo); 9 (Alameda); 10 (Santa Clara); 11 (San Joaquin); 12 (Alpine, Amador, Calaveras, Mariposa, Tuolumne); 13 (San Benito, Santa Cruz); 14 (Fresno, Madera); 15 (Kings, Tulare); 16 (Inyo, Mono); 17 (San Luis Obispo, Santa Barbara); 18 (Ventura); 19 (Los Angeles County minus Los Angeles City); 20 (San Bernardino); 21 (Riverside); 22 (Orange); 23 (San Diego); 24 (Imperial); 25 (Los Angeles City); 26 (Lake, Mendocino); 27 (Sonoma); 29 (El Dorado); 30 (Stanislaus); 31 (Merced); 32 (Monterey); 33 (Kern).
- b. Source of data: 2000 Census updated by Department of Finance projection were available and Department of Health Services statistics for Medi-Cal eligibles.
- c. Non-Minority: Persons aged 60 and older who are Caucasian not of Hispanic origin.
- d. Minority: Persons aged 60 and older who are not Caucasian, or who are Caucasian of Hispanic origin.
- e. Low-Income: Persons aged 60 and older at or below 125 percent of poverty.
- f. Geographical Isolation (Rural): Population not classified as "urban" by the U.S. Bureau of the Census constitutes "rural" population. The U.S. Bureau of the Census defines "urban" for the 1990 census as comprising all territory, population, and housing units in urbanized areas and in places of 2,500 or more persons outside urbanized areas. More specifically, "urban" consists of territory, persons, and housing units in
 - a. Places of 2,500 or more persons incorporated as cities, and towns, but excluding the rural portions of "extended cities."
 - b. Census designated places of 2,500 or more persons.
 - c. Other territory, incorporated or unincorporated, included in urbanized areas.
- g. Medi-Cal Eligibles: Persons aged 60 and older who are Medi-Cal eligible. (DHS Medi-Cal statistics averaged for the year.)

IFF FEDERAL REGULATIONS

Title 42, Chapter 35, Subchapter III, Part A, Section 3025 (Older Americans Act, Section 305(a)(2)

"States shall,

- (C) in consultation with area agencies, in accordance with guidelines issued by the Assistant Secretary, and using the best available data, develop and publish for review and comment a formula for distribution within the State of funds received under this title that takes into account—
- (i) the geographical distribution of older individuals in the State; and
- (ii) the distribution among planning and service areas of older individuals with greatest economic need and older individuals with greatest social need, with particular attention to low-income minority older individuals."

Title 42, Chapter 35, Subchapter I, Section 3002 (29-30) (OAA Section 102 (23-24))

- (23) The term "greatest economic need" means the need resulting from an income level at or below the poverty line.
- (24) The term "greatest social need" means the need caused by noneconomic factors, which include -
 - (A) physical and mental disabilities;
 - (B) language barriers; and
 - (C) cultural, social, or geographical isolation, including isolation caused by racial or ethnic status, that -
 - (i) restricts the ability of an individual to perform normal daily tasks; or
 - (ii) threatens the capacity of the individual to live independently.

WELFARE & INSTITUTIONS CODE 9112

- 9112. (a) The department shall implement an intrastate funding formula in accordance with all federal regulations. This formula shall apply to all federal and state funds allocated for programs provided for under Title III of the federal Older Americans Act (42 U.S.C. Sec. 3021, et seq.).
- (b) The intrastate funding formula shall include all of the following:
- (1) Assurances that all area agencies on aging shall have a fifty thousand dollar (\$50,000) administrative base with the remainder of the allowable administrative dollars allocated to planning and service areas on the basis of number of persons over the age of 60 years.
- (2) (A) When data is available, an annual update by the department for changes in population characteristics to include the number of persons per planning and service area over the age of 60 years and persons in greatest economic or social need as measured by all of the following variables which shall also be annually updated by the department:
- (i) The number of persons over the age of 65 years receiving aid under the State Supplementary Program for the Aged, Blind, and Disabled, provided for under Chapter 3 (commencing with Section 12000) of Part 3 of Division 9.
 - (ii) The number of persons over the age of 75 years.
 - (iii) The number of minority elderly over the age of 60 years.
 - (iv) The number of persons over the age of 60 years living alone.
- (v) The number of non-English-speaking persons over the age of 60 years.
- (B) The weight given to each variable shall simulate the weighting used in the Washington State intrastate funding formula adjusting for the geographic factor.
- (3) A rural factor that guarantees a 105 percent allocation to rural planning and service areas.
- (4) A hold-harmless factor that guarantees that no planning and service area shall have its federal and state allocation of funds under Title III of the federal Older Americans Act (42 U.S.C. Sec. 3021, et seq.), excluding area agency on aging administrative costs and funds carried over from the 1983-84 fiscal year, reduced below the 1984-85 fiscal year funding levels.
- (c) In the event that additional federal or state funds, in excess of those appropriated under the 1984-85 Budget Act, or subsequent Budget Acts are made available for services, these funds shall be used to maintain existing service levels, with the remainder to be distributed to those planning and service areas which have been determined by the department to be under equity until parity is achieved.
- (d) The department shall develop, in conjunction with the intrastate funding formula, a methodology for assuring compliance with the state targeting strategy on an intraplanning and service area basis. In developing this methodology the department shall provide assurances that as additional federal and state service dollars are allocated to the planning and service areas these dollars will be expended on those elderly individuals identified as in greatest economic or social need.

1984/85 Hold Harmless Levels

Counties	PSA	Allocation
Del Norte, Humboldt	1	638,030
Lassen, Modoc, Shasta, Siskiyou, Trinity	. 2	1,343,640
Butte, Colusa, Glenn, Plumas, Tehama	3	1,219,329
Nev, Placer, Sac, Sier, Sutr, Yolo, Yuba	4	2,680,471
Marin	5	543,618
San Francisco	6.	2,564,711
Contra Costa	7	1,412,964
San Mateo	8	1,489,236
Alameda	9	2,706,261
Santa Clara	10	2,178,232
San Joaquin	11	1,096,216
Alpine, Amador, Calav, Mariposa, Tuolumne	12	479,583
San Benito, Santa Cruz	13	1,166,020
Fresno Madera	14	1,774,990
Kings, Tulare	15	1,197,439
Inyo, Mono	16	437,485
San Luis Obispo, Santa Barbara	17	1,286,428
Ventura	18	986,360
Los Angeles County	19	9,665,747
San Bernardino	20	1,989,919
Riverside	21	2,039,507
Orange	22	3,583,827
San Diego	23	4,121,459
Imperial	24	
Los Angeles City	25	8,003,478
Lake, Mendocino	26	
Sonoma	27	
Napa, Solano	28	
El Dorado	29	
Stanislaus	30	
Merced	31	
Monterey	32	
Kern	33	1,130,024
Totals		60,675,041

These numbers are compared to the new allocations for Programs III B, C1, C2, III D, and VII. Totals include both State and Federal funds.

Federal Fiscal Year 2000 Test Allocation Levels

and the second s		
Counties	PSA	Allocation
Del Norte, Humboldt	1	439,053
Lassen, Modoc, Shasta, Siskiyou, Trinity	2	872,065
Butte, Colusa, Glenn, Plumas, Tehama	3	1,051,743
Nev, Placer, Sac, Sier, Sutr, Yolo, Yuba	4	3,661,339
Marin	5	462,806
San Francisco	6	2,344,530
Contra Costa	7	1,583,371
San Mateo	8	1,230,411
Alameda	9	2,567,441
Santa Clara	10	2,312,932
San Joaquin	11	1,203,398
Alpine, Amador, Calav, Mariposa, Tuolumne	12	697,396
San Benito, Santa Cruz	13	566,646
Fresno Madera	14	1,997,487
Kings, Tulare	15	1,055,115
Inyo, Mono	16	350,546
San Luis Obispo, Santa Barbara	17	1,323,255
Ventura	18	1,233,758
Los Angeles County	19	9,958,725
San Bernardino	. 20	2,809,671
Riverside	21	3,126,617
Orange	22	3,993,950
San Diego	23	4,912,086
Imperial	24	355,256
Los Angeles City	25	
Lake, Mendocino	26	601,247
Sonoma	27	
Napa, Solano	28	· .
El Dorado	29	
Stanislaus	30	'
Merced	31	
Monterey	32	694,079
Kern	33	1,340,176
Totals		63,358,748

These numbers are compared to the progam only numbers for III B, C1 & C2. Totals include both State and Federal funds.